## **REMARKS**

These remarks are in reply to the Office action mailed June 18, 2001. With the addition of Claims 70-91, Claims 49-92 are presented herewith for consideration.

## Rejection of Claims 49, 51-56, 58 and 61-67 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 49, 51-56, 58 and 61-67 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,128,520 to Rando ("Rando").

Applicants have amended Claims 49 and 52, as well as Claims 51, 53-56, 58 and 61-67 dependent directly or indirectly thereon, to recite in part:

a graphical environment for a child, the graphical environment presenting a child with a visual event prompting the child to cognitively react by selecting and manipulating said one or more graspable objects in response to said event.

Rando has no disclosure, teaching or suggestion of the amended features of the invention.

Based on the above, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of Claims 49, 51-56, 58 and 61-67 on the stated grounds be withdrawn.

## Rejection of Claims 50, 57, 60 and 69 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 50, 57, 60 and 69 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as obvious over *Rando* in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,252,814 to Tooley ("*Tooley*"). Claims 50, 57, 60 and 69 depend on independent Claims 49 and 52, which as explained above recite limitations which are nowhere disclosed, taught or suggested in *Rando*. *Tooley* adds nothing to the teaching of *Rando* in this regard. Therefore, the cited references do not teach or suggest the claimed invention when taken either alone or in combination with each other. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection on these grounds be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 59 and 68 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 59 and 68 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as obvious over

Rando. Claims 59 and 68 depend on independent Claims 49 and 52, which as

explained above recite limitations which are nowhere disclosed, taught or suggested

in the cited reference. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection on these

grounds be withdrawn.

Based on the above, reconsideration of Claims 49-69, and consideration of

Claims 70-92, is respectfully requested.

Should further questions remain, the Examiner is invited to contact the

undersigned attorney by telephone.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: August 8, 2002

Brian I. Marcus (Reg. No. 34, 511)

VIERRA MAGEN MARCUS

HARMON & DENIRO LLP (415) 369-9660 ext. 205

16